DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 798 FL 014 626

AUTHOR Labarca, Angela; Khanji, Rajai
TITLE Beginning French - Interactants' Communication Strategies.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Communication Skills; Comparative Analysis; *French; Higher Education; *Interviews; Introductory Courses; *Second Language Learning; *Teaching Methods; Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS Communication Strategies; *Strategic Interaction; *Total Physical Response

ABSTRACT

A study of the communication strategies used by beginning language learners and their interviewers centered on the analysis of videotaped interviews of 53 beginning French students at the University of Delaware. The students had been instructed by either the total physical response or the strategic interaction method. Observed communication patterns were rated according to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages/Educational Testing Service scale for the oral performance of elementary students. The results were statistically analyzed, and the findings showed that the higher the student's proficiency rating, the lower his use of communication strategies was. The method of instruction was also found to have an important effect on the students' and interviewers' use of French and on the students' proficiency rating. Students instructed by the strategic interaction method received significantly higher proficiency ratings and used fewer communication strategies to impart meaning. Interviewers reacted to this group by using fewer strategies themselves. Two possible interpretations are suggested: (1) that strategic interaction facilitated students' development of underlying linguistic and interactional competencies, and (2) that students' diminished use of communication strategies in the strategic interaction group indicates a higher degree of control over the activity. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Angela Labarca
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
U.S.A.

Dr. Rajai Khanji
University of Jordan
Amman
Jordan

ED249798

BEGINNING FRENCH - INTERACTANTS' COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

Abstract

Although previous work has thoroughly analyzed the communication strategies (CS) of second language learners (Faerch and Kasper 1983, Tarone 1980, 1977, Tarone et al. 1976), the present research is one of the few attempts at studying the strategies used by both beginning learners and their interviewers during a videotaped interview. Fifty-three beginning French learners were interviewed by instructors other than their own teacher and the videotape was analyzed in search of patterns of communication between the interactants. The students had been instructed either by Total Physical Response (Asher, 1969) or by Strategic Interaction (Di Pietro, 1979).

Data collected were subjected to a correlational and MANOVA analyses in which CS used by interactants, rating obtained in the interview and kind of method used in instruction were the main factors. Significant differences were detected between groups. In general, the higher the proficiency rating obtained by a student, the lower his use of CS was. Furthermore, the method of instruction was found to have an important bearing on the use of French by students and their interviewers, and on the proficiency rating received by the former. Students instructed through the Strategic Interaction Method (SIM) received significantly higher proficiency ratings and used fewer communication strategies to get their meaning across. Interviewers reacted to this group by using fewer strategies as well.

Results can be interpreted from at least two points of view. It appears that SI facilitated students' development of at least two underlying competencies: linguistic and interactional. This finding would be in accordance with Palmer's (1979) theory,

FL014 626

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Angela Labarca

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

which proposes that language proficiency stems from more than a single unitary underlying ability. From another point of view, it could be posited that students' diminished use of CS in the SIM group would indicate a higher degree of control over the activity, as proposed in the Vygotskian paradigm of cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1969).

Introduction

Whenever a second language learner tries to express himself or interact with another speaker of the target language, a wide variety of difficulties arise that may evoke adjustments in his L^2 speech, his switching to L^1 or another language, or withdrawal and abandonment of the attempt to use the target language.

In the past, learner adjustments have been analyzed by contrasting them to the ideal speech of an ideal native speaker. Gradually, however, this rather structural, descriptive approach is giving way to an increasingly more functional one which at first consisted of discourse analysis and which is currently approaching the analysis of discourse events in their interactional (Tarone 1981) and cognitive aspects (Frawley and Lantolf, 1984). This shift is apparent when the definitions below are considered in sequence. Developmentally, a communication strategy has been:

> a systematic attempt by the learner to express or decode meaning in the target language, in situations where the appropriate systematic target language rules have not been formed. (Tarone, Cohen and Dumas, 1976)
>
> the conscious employment of verbal or nonverbal mechanisms for communicating an idea when precise linguistic structures are for some reason not readily available to the learner at a point in communication (Brown, 1980, p. 178).
>
> a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in a situation where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. (Meaning structures include both linguistic and sociolinguistic structures). (Tarone, 1981)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The more recent definition by Tarone not only includes the basic notion of interaction, but also expands the denotation of meaning structures. In addition, this broader definition also implies different research methodology and procedures through which interactional data can be adequately elicited, collected, recorded and analyzed.

The present study takes the above theoretical and methodological considerations into account by including in its analysis not only the strategies used by both learners and interviewers during their interaction, but also the effects of L^2 speakers' instructional history on the interactional event. Furthermore, analyses of the results based on both orthodox interlanguage and Vygotskian psycholinguistic theories are also provided. In this paper, we report on the method and procedures of the study and present and analyze the data. The results are then discussed from two different points of view and recommendations for instruction are also provided.

Method and procedures

Subjects.

Fifty-three first-semester learners of French at the University of Delaware were in two beginning French classes using different instructional methods. Thirty of the subjects were in an SI class and 23 in a TPR class. Both of these classes were taught by the same instructor. After 12 weeks of instruction, students were interviewed by interviewers other than their teacher and their performance in the interview rated.

Interviewers.

Five interviewers conducted the oral interviews. Three of them were instructors and two were graduate teaching assistants in the Language Department of the University of Delaware. All of them were at the time teaching French classes other than those involved in the study. All interviewers received 14 hours of training and practice in giving oral interviews. They were also familiar with the procedures for videotaping the interviews. None of the interviewers had had any contacts with the interviewees before the interview itself, nor had they been given any information about the nature of the students' classroom--either SIM or TPR. Interviewers also acted as raters

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the videotaped interviews, but they did not rate students that they themselves had interviewed.

Procedures:

Subjects signed up for the interview as part of their course's regular activities. Students were offered a bonus grade in the class, if they were to do well in the interview. It was explained to them that in order to do well on the interview, they needed to do as much talking as possible during the conversation with the interviewer.

Interviews lasted between 10 and 15 minutes and were conducted using the customary FSI procedure.[1] Interviewers tried to elicit as much oral language as possible by covering varied topics and by introducing role-play situations.

Subsequently, interviews were rated using the expanded ACTFL/ETS scale for rating the oral performance of elementary students. Although the interviewers also served as raters, they did not rate students that they themselves had interviewed. Videotapes of the interviews were also analyzed by the researchers who tallied the CS used by both interactants.

Methods of instruction:

As mentioned before, two communication-based methods were used to instruct each class: Total Physical Response (TPR) and the Strategic Interaction Method (SIM). TPR (Asher, 1969) focuses on the acquisition of the target language through physically reacting to oral commands given by the instructor. SIM (Di Pietro, 1979) stresses acquisition and the development of interactional skills by introducing problem situations or conflicts, for whose solution groups of students develop scripts, which are later acted out for the rest of the class and analyzed with a focus on communicative effectiveness.

---

1. For a detailed description of the interview procedure see Oller 1979, or ETS 1983

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results

Table 1 presents means and standard deviations of the different communication strategies [2] used by interviewees in each group and by the entire group of 53 subjects. Note that in this table total CS figures do not include the use of mime by subjects. Mime is included in the grand total, however. As indicated on the table, oral interview ratings means and standard deviations are included for comparative purposes only.

As it can be seen in table 1, mean use of each CS is always higher for the TPR group, a pattern that will be repeated in all of the findings. Among the most frequently used CS used by the students, message abandonment accounts for 36% of all CS, while language switch, appeal for assistance and mime account for 27%, 21%, and 16%, respectively.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations by student strategies and by groups

Student strategies	TPR group (n=23)	SIM group (n=30)	Entire group (n=53)
Appeal for assistance	$\bar{x}$=4.21 S.D.=1.85	$\bar{x}$=2.74 S.D.=1.32	$\bar{x}$=3.47 S.D.=1.76
Language switch	$\bar{x}$=5.09 S.D.=4.47	$\bar{x}$=3.88 S.D.=1.84	$\bar{x}$=4.42 S.D.=3.31
Message abandonment	$\bar{x}$=6.19 S.D.=3.74	$\bar{x}$=4.05 S.D.=2.35	$\bar{x}$=5.14 S.D.=3.29
Yes/no, avoidance	$\bar{x}$=4.31 S.D.=1.85	$\bar{x}$=3.41 S.D.=2.19	$\bar{x}$=3.92 S.D.=2.01

---

2. In this investigation, Tarone's typology was used [see Tarone, 1980] with only one minor modification: for the interviewers, topic avoidance was replaced with topic shift.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Memorized routine	$\bar{x}$=5.66 S.D.=2.76	$\bar{x}$=3.26 S.D.=2.07	$\bar{x}$=4.52 S.D.=2.71
Answering in full	$\bar{x}$=2.76 S.D.=1.53	$\bar{x}$=5.23 S.D.=3.20	$\bar{x}$=4.41 S.D.=2.97
Total verbal	$\bar{x}$=28.47 S.D.=8.78	$\bar{x}$=16.33 S.D.=7.22	$\bar{x}$=20.00 S.D.=8.88
Mime	$\bar{x}$=4.42 S.D.=1.42	$\bar{x}$=2.00 S.D.=1.00	$\bar{x}$=3.21 S.D.=1.72
Grand total (Verbal and mime)	$\bar{x}$=28.47 S.D.=8.78	$\bar{x}$=17.60 S.D.=7.64	$\bar{x}$=22.32 S.D.=9.74
Interview rating*	$\bar{x}$=1.96 S.D.=1.10	$\bar{x}$=3.36 S.D.=1.35	$\bar{x}$=2.75 S.D.=1.42

*These statistics are provided for comparison purposes only.

Table 2 presents means and standard deviations of the communication strategies used by interviewers when interviewing learners from each group and all learners taken as a group. It can be easily seen that the previous pattern detected with the students in each of the instructional groups is repeated with the interviewers, except for the "asking information questions" strategy. Indeed, in the SIM group, the occurrence of information questions was not only higher than in the TPR group, but it was also significantly more frequent than "yes/no questions" in the SIM group itself.

Table 2. Means and standard deviations by interviewer strategies and by groups

Interviewer strategies	TPR group (n=23)	SIM group (n=30)	Entire group (n=53)
Choice question	$\bar{x}$=5.00 S.D.=2.04	$\bar{x}$=3.83 S.D.=2.11	$\bar{x}$=4.33 S.D.=2.14
Information question	$\bar{x}$=7.69 S.D.=2.83	$\bar{x}$=8.68 S.D.=2.79	$\bar{x}$=8.25 S.D.=2.82
Circumlocution	$\bar{x}$=5.63 S.D.=2.03	$\bar{x}$=3.92 S.D.=1.44	$\bar{x}$=4.70 S.D.=1.92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Topic shift	$\bar{x}$=3.38 S.D.=1.50	$\bar{x}$=2.71 S.D.=1.34	$\bar{x}$=2.96 S.D.=1.52
Paraphrasing	$\bar{x}$=4.33 S.D.=2.19	$\bar{x}$=3.55 S.D.=1.54	$\bar{x}$=3.97 S.D.=1.93
Total interviewer	$\bar{x}$=30.86 S.D.=7.08	$\bar{x}$=23.56 S.D.=6.58	$\bar{x}$=26.73 S.D.=7.66

Table 3 contains selected correlations between the use of certain communicative strategies and the oral interview rating or other strategies. As in the other tables, correlations are presented broken down by group and by entire group.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. Selected correlations between student and interviewer strategies by group and entire group

Interview rating or communication strategies used by students & interviewers	TPR group	SIM group	Entire group
total verb CS & total CS	.66 (.0001)	.40 (.01)	.63 (.0001)
total CS & total CS	.60 (.001)	.41 (.01)	.63 (.0001)
mes. abandon. & topic shift	.87 (.021)	.59 (.002)	.71 (.0001)
appeal assis. & circumloc.	.39 (.036)	.24 (.149)	.47 (.001)
appeal assis. & paraphrase	-.01 (.48)	.22 (.231)	-.12 (.247)
mes. abandon. & rating	-.26 (.118)	-.23 (.161)	-.34 (.013)
mime & rating	-.45 (.024)	-.64 (.001)	-.63 (.0001)
appeal assis. & rating	-.41 (.024)	-.29 (.085)	-.48 (.001)
total CS & rating	-.35 (.04)	-.36 (.02)	-.53 (.0001)

Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between several student and interviewer strategies. Some of them are discussed below.

When all subjects are taken as a whole, fairly high correlations are obtained between different communication strategies or between strategies used and overall rating in the interview. When the analysis is done on each group separately, however, a somewhat different picture emerges. A discussion of results for the entire group and for each of the groups taken separately follows.

As was to be expected, a significant correlation of .63 ($p. < .0001$) was calculated between the total number of occurrences of verbal strategies used by all students and by the interviewers. The same significant correlation of .63 ($p. < .0001$) obtains between the use of both verbal and non-verbal CS by students and by interviewers. These correlations are strong and significant for the TPR group--.66 ($p. < .0001$) and .60 ($p. < .001$), respectively--but lower for the SIM group: .40 ($p. < .01$) and .41 ($p. < .01$).

Whenever rating in the oral interview was correlated with CS used by students or by interviewers, negative and fairly high

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

correlations were calculated. For example, rating and mime are significantly correlated for the group as a whole (-.64, p. <.0001) and for each group separately (TPR: -.44, p. <.01; SIM: -.64, p. <.0001). The relationship between rating in the interview and the total number of CS (verbal and non-verbal) used by the students was also significant and negative, -.53, as were the correlations between rating and message abandonment and between rating and topic shift. The latter were -.52 (p. <.0001) for the whole group, and -.38 (p. <.03) for the TPR and -.39 (p. <.01) for the SIM group. These results indicate that the higher the rating, the fewer CS are used by the students when conversing with the interviewers. It is apparent that more proficient students seem to rely more and more on their acquired linguistic competence when interacting with an interviewer rather than on extensive use of CS.

The above findings have further support when one analyzes the kind and frequency of CS used by the interviewers when interacting with lower-level students. For instance, a significant correlation of .87 (p. <.0001) was found between message abandonment by TPR interviewees and topic shift by the interviewers, while the same correlation drops to .59 (p. <.002) for SIM interviewees. In general, message abandonment frequently took the form of yes/no answers from the students, accompanied by staring at the floor or the ceiling of the room. This behavior was very often followed by change of topic by the interviewer.

Taking the group as a whole, there is a relationship of .47 (p. <.001) between appeal for assistance by the student and the use of circumlocution by the interviewer. Again, for the less proficient group(TPR), the correlation was higher (.39) than for the more proficient SIM group (.24). On the other hand, the same student strategy--appeal for assistance--probably did not evoke as much use of paraphrasing as of circumlocution by the interviewers. In fact, the correlations between appeal for assistance and paraphrasing are non-significant and low. There is a low and negative correlation of -.12 for the whole group, and of .22 for the SIM group. The latter correlation might indicate that the interviewers were more likely to paraphrase if the student was more proficient.

Appeal for assistance from the student is also related to overall rating of the interview, as it was to be expected. For the entire group, the correlation is -.48. For the SIM group it is -.29 and for the TPR group is -.41. This shows that the higher the rating of the student, the lower the frequency of use of appeal for assistance was--which is in line with results analyzed above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analyses of variance

Tables 4 and 5 show univariate and multivariate F tests of the CS used by both interviewees and interviewers in each of the two groups.

Table 4. Summary of analyses of variance of student CS by instructional group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_o = m_1 = m_2$
$H_a = m_1 \neq m_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 6 and 46 d.f.= 8.3724 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses: Student communication strategies by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
appeal for assistance	243.6667	21.0266	.0001
language switch	1.9270	0.6043	.4446
message abandonment	1.7335	0.1670	.6845
memorized answer	136.8665	8.2783	.0059
answering in full	100.4266	14.5569	.0004
mime	186.5687	26.1512	.0001

d.f.= 1, 51

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5. Summary of analyses of variance of interviewer CS by instructional group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_o = m_1 = m_2$
$H_a = m_1 \neq m_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 6 and 46 d.f.= 6.4644 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses of interviewer communication strategies by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
topic shift	140.2297	16.4361	.0002
circumlocution	3.5843	1.4403	.2357
paraphrasing	9.0868	2.4835	.1213
yes-no question	10.1837	1.9757	.1660
choice question	25.4479	2.5815	.1143
information question	22.7875	3.1400	.0824

d.f.= 1, 51

The analyses of variance presented above confirm the pattern of findings delineated before for general statistics and the correlations. Subjects in the SIM group use CS in a significantly different way from TPR subjects. For example, SIM students used mime significantly less (p. <.0001) than TPR students. Consequently, they gave significantly more full answers (p. <.0004) instead of memorized answers (p. <.005) and required significantly less assistance from the interviewer (p. <.0001) as well. (See table 4).

The above pattern of findings is further corroborated by the multivariate analysis of interviewers' differential use of CS depending on the instructional background of the interviewee --which is significant at the .0001 level. (See table 5). In fact, interviewers did not have to shift the topic with SIM learners as much as with TPR learners (p. <0002) and also asked significantly more information questions of the former (p. <.08) instead of choice questions (nonsignificant contrast, p. <.11).

Table 6 below presents further evidence describing the differences between TPR and SIM subjects. The table presents analyses of variance of subjects' scores on five different measures. Once again, students in the SIM group outperform the TPR group on several performance tasks, including the oral

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interview, a dictation, a grammar test, and a cloze test.

Table 6. Summary of analyses of variance of students' scores by group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_o = m_1 = m_2$
$H_a = m_1 \neq m_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 4 and 48 d.f.= 9.8138 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses: Test measures by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
oral interview	2906.6475	40.9371	.0001
dictation	628.5336	35.0988	.0001
grammar test	418.1808	11.1870	.0016
cloze test	19.9186	3.3042	.0750

d.f.= 1, 51

Conclusions

According to the results described in the section above, there indeed seems to be some kind of relationship between the instructional method and some learner variables that made SIM students more effective in their conversation with the interviewers. It is thus apparent that significant gains were made by engaging a group of students in interactional activities of the kind used in the SIM approach. In a sense then, this study seems to provide at least one answer to the following question:

> Would it be feasible to have learners engage in communicative situations in the classroom which require a more extensive knowledge of L^2 than that which the learners can be expected to have? (Faerch and Kasper, 1983, p. 55)

More specifically, results clearly indicate not only that students in the SIM group used fewer CS on the average, but also that they had more to say so that they kept the interlocutors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interested and asking more information questions than the average number of questions for the group as a whole. (See table 2.) Moreover, it is also clear that this decreased use of strategies does not mark the appearance of an overall reductionist-type[3] of approach to the interactional event by SIM learners. Rather, both the ratings received by the students and an analysis of the protocols reveal that it heralds the emergence of fluency and communicative confidence in ways suggested by Savignon(1983) and Canale and Swain (1980).

The results obtained can be analyzed in the light of Palmer's and Canale and Swain's theories on the structure of communicative competence (Palmer, 1979, Bachman and Palmer 1982, Canale and Swain 1980, Canale 1983). Both of these theories propose a non-unitary basis for second language competence. Palmer postulates at least two kinds of underlying competence, namely, linguistic and pragmatic[4]. Canale and Swain's framework includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. In accordance with these theories therefore, learners in the SIM group were able to develop at least two coordinated kinds of competence--linguistic and interactional--while learners in the TPR group developed linguistic competence only. Indeed, the evidence shows that SIM learners outperformed TPR learners on compartmentalized (grammar test) as well as integrative measures (oral interview, dictation, cloze), as it can be seen in table 6. It looks as though with this SIM group Hatch's statement became completely functional:

> Language learning evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations. (Hatch, 1978)

The impact of the instructional method on the development of the ability to carry on conversations is probably the single most important finding of this study. As Faerch and Kasper point out,

> ...the context in which the learner has learned his interlanguage seems particularly powerful. (Faerch and Kasper 1983, p. XVIII).

---

3. For a discussion of functional and formal reduction strategies, see Faerch and Kasper 1983, pp. 41-44.

4. This model was later expanded to include sociolinguistic competence as well. (See Bachman and Palmer 1982, p. 462)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The direction and magnitude of the context effect detected in this research is diametrically opposed to that proposed by these authors, however. Faerch and Kasper (1983) suggest that students should not only be made aware of their using CS, but also that they should be taught "how to compensate for insufficient linguistic resources by using the totality of their communicative resources creatively and appropriately." (p. 56). The problem with such a classroom approach lies in that, according to our results, communicative ability emerges precisely when students make less use of CS, rather than when they learn how to use them. We disagree with these authors in that there should be an attempt to make students aware of purportedly successful strategies. Instead, what we see actually happening in the classrooms is that ability evolves out of routinely and actively participating in many student-generated conversations during the course of instruction.

A far more powerful theoretical background in which to insert the results of this study is provided by Vygotskyan psycholinguistics--a model that has been fully explored by several researchers in the past and more recently at the University of Delaware by Frawley and Lantolf(1985, 1984, 1983). Paramount to this model are the principles of control, continuous access, and externalization, which we will briefly discuss below following Frawley and Lantolf (1984).

In Vygotskyan theory, thought has a social basis and it can only be internalized and made individualistic and unique through language. Language is then the tool through which cognition develops in individuals and speaking is thus considered a cognitive activity that facilitates the tasks of learning about the world and others. Individuals "grow" cognitively from being controlled or regulated by objects, to being controlled by other individuals, to finally becoming self-regulated. This growth does not occur in absolute or chronological terms, however. In theory, for an adult, all forms of control or regulation of one's own cognition are continuously accessible and usable, depending on the difficulty of the cognitive task at hand for each individual knower.[5] Thus, one can and usually does use less sophisticated forms of control when something turns out to be difficult. One also externalizes inner speech when faced with something difficult to solve or do. This is the typical "talking to yourself" speech that we do whentrying to regain

---

5. This notion of continuous access is in sharp contrast with the lockstep development of cognition as conceived by Piagetians.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

self-regulation by externalizing what we do know about the problem. With Frawley and Lantolf, we would like to consider L^2 elementary discourse as a sustained attempt to regain self-control, since the task at hand in these cases will usually be difficult.

In light of the above, our contention is that students in the SIM group did in fact get rehearsals of difficult tasks--albeit indirectly and informally--by being continually involved in tasks in which they had to produce their own speech on the basis of their own ideas and feelings. The students' background was therefore rich in experiences and attempts to gain self-control, which was most probably the reason why their speech was more coherent and generally interesting. Although both groups had been instructed through non-traditional methodologies, one of the classrooms was typically other-regulated or controlled by teacher-generated kind of activities (TPR class), while the other was more often than not a constant struggle for self-regulation (SIM class) on the basis of student-generated scripts to solve common or uncommon problems. Work in progress by Labarca, is revealing more interesting data on the structure of discourse in both groups as it was affected by the kind of activity typical of each classroom.

References

ACTFL/ETS Provisional Proficiency Guidelines. n.d. Hastings-on-Hudson, New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Asher, John. 1977. Learning another language through actions. Los Gatos, California: Sky Oaks Productions.

Asher, John. 1969. "The total physical response approach to second language learning." The Modern Language Journal 58: 24-32.

Bachman, Lyle and Adrian S. Palmer. 1982. "The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency." TESOL Quarterly 16:449-464.

Brown, H. Douglas, Carlos Yorio and Ruth H. Crymes, eds. 1977. On TESOL '77: Teaching and learning English as a second

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

language. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Canale, Michael. 1983. "On some dimensions of language proficiency." Ch. 20 in Oller, John W., Jr., ed. 1983.

Canale, Michael and Merril Swain. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." Applied Linguistics 1: 1-47.

Faerch, Claus and Gabriele Kasper, eds. 1983. Strategies in interlanguage communication. London and New York: Longman.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1982. "The open-ended scenario: A new approach to conversation." TESOL Quarterly 16: 449-464.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1979. "Verbal strategies in the modern language classroom." Bulletin of the FMLA 57: 3-10.

Educational Testing Service. 1982. Foreign language oral proficiency assessment. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.

Finn, Jeremy D. 1974. A general model for multivariate analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Frawley, William and James P. Lantolf. 1985. "L^2 discourse: A Vygotskyan perspective." Applied Linguistics 6.

Frawley, William and James P. Lantolf. 1984. "Speaking and self-order: A critique of orthodox L^2 Research." Studies in Second Language Acquisition: In press.

Labarca, Angela. In progress. "The structure of elementary proficiency."

Lantolf, James P. and William Frawley. 1983. "Second language performance and Vygotskyan psycholinguistics." 10th LACUS Forum. Laval University.

Oller, John W., Jr., ed. 1983. Issues in language testing research. Rowley, Mas.: Newbury House Publishers.

Oller, John W., Jr. 1979. Language tests at school: A pragmatic approach. London: Longman.

Palmer, Adrian. 1979. "Compartmentalized and integrated control: An assessment of some evidence for two kinds of competence and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

implications for the classroom." Language Learning 29: 169-180. Reprinted in Oller, John W., Jr. 1983.

Savignon, Sandra J. 1983. Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Tarone, Elaine E. 1980. "Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage." Language Learning 30:417-431.

Tarone, Elaine E. 1977. "Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report." In: Brown, H. Douglas, Carlos A. Yorio and Ruth H. Crymes, eds. 1977.

Tarone, Elaine, A. Cohen and G. Dumas. 1976. "A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication strategies." Working Papers in Bilingualism 9: 76-90. Reprinted in Faerch, Claus and Gabriele Kasper, eds. 1983.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1962. Thought and language. Edited and translated by Eugenia Hanfman and Gertrude Vakar. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. Selected correlations between student and interviewer strategies by group and entire group

Interview rating or communication strategies used by students & interviewers	TPR group	SIM group	Entire group
total verb CS & total CS	.66 (.0001)	.40 (.01)	.63 (.0001)
total CS & total CS	.60 (.001)	.41 (.01)	.63 (.0001)
mes. abandon. & topic shift	.87 (.021)	.59 (.002)	.71 (.0001)
appeal assis. & circumloc.	.39 (.036)	.24 (.149)	.47 (.001)
appeal assis. & paraphrase	-.01 (.48)	.22 (.231)	-.12 (.247)
mes. abandon. & rating	-.26 (.118)	-.23 (.161)	-.34 (.013)
mime & rating	-.42 (.024)	-.64 (.001)	-.63 (.0001)
appeal assis. & rating	-.41 (.024)	-.29 (.095)	-.48 (.001)
total CS & rating	-.35 (.04)	-.36 (.02)	-.53 (.0001)

Table 4. Summary of analyses of variance of student CS by instructional group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_0 = a_1 = a_2$
$H_a = a_1 \neq a_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 6 and 46 d.f.= 8.3724 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses: Student communication strategies by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
appeal for assistance	243.6667	21.0266	.0001
language switch	1.9270	0.6043	.4446
message abandonment	1.7335	0.1670	.6845
memorized answer	136.8665	8.2783	.0059
answering in full	100.4266	14.5569	.0004
mime	186.5687	26.1512	.0001

d.f.= 1, 51

Table 5. Summary of analyses of variance of interviewer CS by instructional group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_0 = a_1 = a_2$
$H_a = a_1 \neq a_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 6 and 46 d.f.= 6.4644 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses of interviewer communication strategies by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
topic shift	140.2297	16.4361	.0002
circumlocution	3.5843	1.4403	.2357
paraphrasing	9.0868	2.4835	.1213
yes-no question	10.1837	1.9757	.1660
choice question	25.4479	2.5815	.1143
information question	22.7875	3.1400	.0824

d.f.= 1, 51

Table 6. Summary of analyses of variance of students' scores by group

Multivariate analysis
Hypotheses: $H_0 = a_1 = a_2$
$H_a = a_1 \neq a_2$

Computed F (approximation for likelihood ratio) at 4 and 48 d.f.= 9.8138 (p. <.0001)

Univariate analyses: Test measures by group.

	Mean squares	F	p
oral interview	2906.6475	40.9371	.0001
dictation	628.5336	35.0988	.0001
grammar test	418.1808	11.1870	.0016
cloze test	19.9186	3.3042	.0750

d.f.= 1, 51

BEST COPY AVAILABLE